

Thurs 10/4

- Brent

still working on billing

quote from RAE 1936 - w/ ~~map~~ map

told him we have a small re-route coming. Will send to him next week

- he'll need to send someone to Olympia
- and we'll have to amend contract to include

Item 3

Nancy called

Ivy did re-route around allotment
Dana will print 3 sets for us.

Talked to Ivy - don't need Dan Brackin to do additional work for re-route

→ Dana has maps done - at Nancy's desk
- get with him the week of 15th

Corkran, Doug

From: Brown, Molly
Sent: Wednesday, October 17, 2001 4:12 PM
To: Kimberly St Hillaire @ BPA (E-mail); Corkran, Doug
Cc: Polzin, Scott; Hencke, James; Findley, Angela; Smithline, Scott
Subject: Schultz allotment

Hi folks,

We are having to add a re-route to Segment A. It goes around a tribal allotment at colockum road. Both the new line and the existing line would be routed around this property. On the existing line it would be between (about) 30/3 and 27/3. The reroute is within a mile of the existing route. I have ortho quad that show this reroute. (Kimberly, you or Nancy have a set.)

The new right-of-way would be 350 feet wide. 75' to the edge from each transmission line and 200' between them. Is it safe to assume that for the draft EIS, your searches included this area? Do we need to adjust the write-ups to include this?

Molly

Corkran, Doug

From: Corkran, Doug
Sent: Wednesday, October 17, 2001 4:33 PM
To: Brown, Molly; 'Kimberly St Hillaire @ BPA (E-mail)'
Cc: Polzin, Scott; Hencke, James; Findley, Angela; Smithline, Scott
Subject: RE: Schultz allotment

this will change the area of disturbance, by replacing and removing towers on the existing line, so, be aware that the disturbance area calculations will change (again). If anyone is using area of disturbance in general discussions, they should make sure they are using current numbers (give me until next week to generate these numbers!).

Doug

-----Original Message-----

From: Brown, Molly
Sent: Wednesday, October 17, 2001 4:12 PM
To: Kimberly St Hillaire @ BPA (E-mail); Corkran, Doug
Cc: Polzin, Scott; Hencke, James; Findley, Angela; Smithline, Scott
Subject: Schultz allotment

Hi folks,

We are having to add a re-route to Segment A. It goes around a tribal allotment at colockum road. Both the new line and the existing line would be routed around this property. On the existing line it would be between (about) 30/3 and 27/3. The reroute is within a mile of the existing route. I have ortho quad that show this reroute. (Kimberly, you or Nancy have a set.)

The new right-of-way would be 350 feet wide. 75' to the edge from each transmission line and 200' between them. Is it safe to assume that for the draft EIS, your searches included this area? Do we need to adjust the write-ups to include this?

Molly

Brown, Molly

From: Brown, Molly
Sent: Thursday, October 18, 2001 3:14 PM
To: Corkran, Doug
Subject: allotment reroute

I talked to Lou and these are the results...

Assume 1150 foot spacing for towers.

The angle towers would be dead-ends so they would get new footings. BPA would build new towers adjacent to the existing ones and then take out the existing ones.

When dismantling the existing line, they would leave the footings and cut off any steel members at a foot underground. If it is in a cultivated field they would go down 3 feet to cut it off.

Molly

Brown, Molly

From: Brown, Molly
Sent: Thursday, October 18, 2001 3:19 PM
To: Nancy Wittpenn (E-mail)
Subject: alternatives

Nancy,

Should I treat the allotment reroute as part of the alignment? Or is that an alternative like Bnorth and Bsouth? Do you think that we will have to explain ourselves in the EIS as to why we are doing this reroute?

Molly

Brown, Molly

From: History/Archaeology [histarch@televar.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 25, 2001 11:20 AM
To: Brown, Molly
Subject: Schultz-Hanford realignment

Hey Molly,

The material you sent regarding the latest realignment has arrived. I've checked the records and the realignment does not change what we have already provided you - in other words, no additional recorded resources than those we already have addressed in our DEIS submittal are within 1 mile of the realigned corridor. I will put that statement into a short letter to you for Adeline's signature and there is no need for a cost adjustment to our contract. I also will send you a disk with the minor wording change we discussed previously, a small addition that reflects my records search for this latest alignment, and calling to a close our DEIS contract with PB.

And it sounds like there won't be a survey contract with the CCT after all - they gave the contract to the Yakama (even though we were required to demonstrate that we would include both the Wanapum and the Yakama in our project and they haven't contacted us at all about including the CCT in theirs - there is going to be fallout so duck).

Brent

Brown, Molly

From: Brown, Molly
Sent: Monday, October 29, 2001 3:07 PM
To: Dana Collins (E-mail)
Subject: reroute

Dana,

Could you give me a distance on the reroute? Both existing and the reroute.

Molly

Brown, Molly

From: Collins, Dana O - TIS-3 [docollins@bpa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, October 30, 2001 10:24 AM
To: 'Brown, Molly'
Subject: RE: reroute

The existing segment is: 1.04 mi.
The re-route is 1.27 mi

DC

-----Original Message-----

From: Brown, Molly [mailto:BrownMo@pbworld.com]
Sent: Monday, October 29, 2001 3:07 PM
To: Dana Collins (E-mail)
Subject: reroute

Dana,

Could you give me a distance on the reroute? Both existing and the reroute.

Molly

Brown, Molly

From: Collins, Dana O - TIS-3 [docollins@bpa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, November 01, 2001 3:27 PM
To: Brown, Molly
Subject: re-route lu/own info



segarrlu.xls

Molly,

Here's the excel file for the seg A reroute around the indian allotment.
New codes for you HA!
under segment; Srvy A North - means original plan for seg A to be to the
North, w/ location coming from survey.
Anewrr; new reroute of segment A around allotment
Existrr; reroute of existing transmission line.

<<segarrlu.xls>>

Dana Collins
GIS Analyst
503-230-5929

1
SEGMENT = Anewrr
OWNER = BLM
LANDUSE = Grasslands-Herbaceous
LENGTH = 103.134018
MILES = 0.019533

2
SEGMENT = Anewrr
OWNER = BLM
LANDUSE = Shrubland
LENGTH = 187.925545
MILES = 0.035592

3
SEGMENT = Anewrr
OWNER = UNKNOWN
LANDUSE = Grasslands-Herbaceous
LENGTH = 617.319061
MILES = 0.116916

4
SEGMENT = Anewrr
OWNER = UNKNOWN
LANDUSE = Shrubland
LENGTH = 5671.296387
MILES = 1.074109

5
SEGMENT = Anewrr
OWNER = UNKNOWN
LANDUSE = Unknown
LENGTH = 102.822662
MILES = 0.019474

6
SEGMENT = Existrr
OWNER = BLM
LANDUSE = Grasslands-Herbaceous
LENGTH = 176.433594
MILES = 0.033415

7
SEGMENT = Existrr
OWNER = UNKNOWN
LANDUSE = Grasslands-Herbaceous
LENGTH = 366.707832
MILES = 0.069452

8
SEGMENT = Existrr
OWNER = UNKNOWN
LANDUSE = Shrubland
LENGTH = 6011.390869
MILES = 1.138521

9
SEGMENT = Existrr
OWNER = UNKNOWN
LANDUSE = Unknown

LENGTH = 300.634872
MILES = 0.056938

10

SEGMENT = Srvy A North
OWNER = BLM
LANDUSE = Grasslands-Herbaceous
LENGTH = 452.485687
MILES = 0.085698

11

SEGMENT = Srvy A North
OWNER = BLM
LANDUSE = Shrubland
LENGTH = 29.96352
MILES = 0.005675

12

SEGMENT = Srvy A North
OWNER = UNKNOWN
LANDUSE = Deciduous Forest
LENGTH = 49.174435
MILES = 0.009313

13

SEGMENT = Srvy A North
OWNER = UNKNOWN
LANDUSE = Evergreen Forest
LENGTH = 120.40686
MILES = 0.022804

14

SEGMENT = Srvy A North
OWNER = UNKNOWN
LANDUSE = Grasslands-Herbaceous
LENGTH = 976.668907
MILES = 0.184975

15

SEGMENT = Srvy A North
OWNER = UNKNOWN
LANDUSE = Mixed Forest
LENGTH = 71.232452
MILES = 0.013491

16

SEGMENT = Srvy A North
OWNER = UNKNOWN
LANDUSE = Shrubland
LENGTH = 3798.135307
MILES = 0.719344

Reroute of Segment A (New line)

Owner	Cover type	feet	miles
BLM	Grasslands-Herbaceous	103,134,018	0.019533
BLM	Shrubland	187,925,545	0.035592
UNKNOWN	Grasslands-Herbaceous	617,319,061	0.116916
UNKNOWN	Shrubland	5671,296,387	1.074109
UNKNOWN	Unknown	102,822,662	0.019474
Total		6682,497,673	1.265624

Owner	Cover type	feet	miles	Land Ownership Percentage
BLM	Grasslands-Herbaceous	291,059,563	0.043555505	4%
Unknown	Shrubland	6,391,438,111	0.956444495	96%
		6682,497,673		
				Cover Type Percentage
	Grasslands-Herbaceous	720,453,079	0.107811946	11%
	Shrubland	5,859,221,932	0.876801193	88%
	Unknown	102,822,662	0.015386861	1%
		6682,497,673		

Reroute of Existing line

Owner	Type	feet	miles
BLM	Grasslands-Herbaceous	176,433,594	0.033415
UNKNOWN	Grasslands-Herbaceous	366,707,832	0.069452
UNKNOWN	Shrubland	6011,390,869	1.138521
UNKNOWN	Unknown	300,634,872	0.056938
Total		6855,167,167	1.298326

Owner	Type	feet	miles	Land Ownership Percentage
BLM	Grasslands-Herbaceous	176,433,594	0.025737315	3%
Unknown	Shrubland	6,678,735,573	0.974262685	97%
		6855,167,167		
				Cover Type Percentage
	Grasslands-Herbaceous	543,141,426	0.079230953	8%
	Shrubland	6,011,390,869	0.876913826	88%
	Unknown	300,634,872	0.043855221	4%
		6855,167,167		

Segment A (As surveyed)

Owner	Type	Feet	miles
BLM	Grasslands-Herbaceous	452,485,687	0.085698
BLM	Shrubland	29,963,52	0.005675
UNKNOWN	Deciduous Forest	49,174,435	0.009313
UNKNOWN	Evergreen Forest	120,406,86	0.022804
UNKNOWN	Grasslands-Herbaceous	976,668,907	0.184975
UNKNOWN	Mixed Forest	71,232,452	0.013491
UNKNOWN	Shrubland	3798,135,307	0.719344
Total		5498,067,168	1.0413

Owner	Type	Feet	miles	Land Ownership Percentage
BLM	Grasslands-Herbaceous	482,449,207	0.087748875	9%
Unknown	Shrubland	5,015,617,961	0.912251125	91%
		5498,067,168		
				Cover Type Percentage
	Grasslands-Herbaceous	1,429,154,594	0.259937638	26%
	Shrubland	3,828,098,827	0.696262652	70%
	Deciduous Forest	49,174,435	0.008943949	1%
	Evergreen Forest	120,406,86	0.021899852	2%
	Mixed Forest	71,232,452	0.012955908	1%
		5498,067,168		

November 2, 2001

Brown, Molly

From: St Hilaire, Kimberly - KEC-4 [krsthilaire@bpa.gov]
Sent: Friday, November 02, 2001 3:32 PM
To: Brown, Molly
Cc: Corkran, Doug; Wittpenn, Nancy A - KEC-4
Subject: Segment A reroute

Hello Molly,

The reroute around the allottee's parcel does not affect vegetation sections, including rare plants.

You can make a minor change to the wetlands sections as follows:

Section 3.2.2.1 Segment A

See page 3-8, third paragraph: Delete the last sentence ("Cook Creek and Wilson creeks are the only wetlands identified as forested crossed by this line segment.") The reroute is outside of the forested wetland designation and in scrub-shrub designated wetlands.

Table 3.2.2: In the first Cooke Creek column add, "Three channels designated as...." These are the palustrine scrub-shrub wetlands, seasonally flooded. Delete the next column for Cooke Creek which is for the palustrine forested wetland to the north.

Chapter 4 looks fine. It does say that some trees may need to cut along Cooke Creek. Since there may be scattered cottonwoods in the reroute I think we should leave that in.

I don't have a current electronic copy so please search for Cook (remember I left out the -e at the end!) Creek to see if I missed any text about forested wetlands along the creek. If so, delete because it is all scrub-shrub in the reroute.

Good luck!
Kimberly

Corkran, Doug

From: Corkran, Doug
Sent: Tuesday, November 06, 2001 4:32 PM
To: Brown, Molly
Subject: Chapter 3 Rerourt language

This is on the PAO drive too.

needs to be added into Chapter 3 when Barb is done working on it.



To be inserted
Chapter 3 Page ...

To be inserted on Page 3-20 at the end of Section 3.4.2.1 (Segment A vegetation discussion)

A reroute of the existing Vantage-Raver transmission line and the original alignment of Segment A has been made. The existing Vantage-Raver line will be rerouted 1.30 miles , approximately 0.29 miles longer than it is now. Segment A would parallel this reroute for a distance of 1.27 miles, approximately 0.23 miles longer than Segment A was originally planned. The Segment A reroute would reduce impacts to forested lands and grasslands and increase the impacts to shrublands compared to the original alignment. The existing Vantage-Raver reroute would cause similar changes in impacts.

(Molly- do we need to discuss removal impacts?) If so add this sentence to the paragraph:

Removal of the existing Vantage Raver line would cause additional impacts to vegetation along 1.01 miles from equipment passage and tower removal.

Brown, Molly

From: Campbell, Paula J - TRF/Bell-1 [pjcampbell@bpa.gov]
Sent: Monday, November 26, 2001 1:22 PM
To: 'Gregory Crites'; Driessen, Laurens C - TNP-TPP-3; Tyson, Ivy L - TNLC-TPP-3; Albrecht, Richard - TNFF-TPP-3; Brown, Molly; Wolcott, Marian - TR-TPP-4; Wittpenn, Nancy A - KEC-4
Cc: Sherrill, Karen C - TR-TPP-4; McCalib, Jerry T - TR-TPP-4
Subject: Schultz - Watoma PEP--ACCESS DENIED
Importance: High

FYI - For the proposed re-route around the allottee property in Kittitas County, Section 6, Township 18 North Range 20 East, I received a letter this morning from the attorney for Gaylord Kellogg (Cooke-Coleman LLC) stating that they are not willing to grant BPA staff, employees, contractors, sub-contractors or others working for or on behalf of BPA access for ANY purpose and that any access would be treated as a trespass.

Brown, Molly

From: Findley, Angela
Sent: Wednesday, March 06, 2002 2:11 PM
To: Brown, Molly
Subject: RE: BPA FOIA

I received your original email 10/17/01 regarding the Shultz allotment reroute. I did not revise any of the prior analyses for the Socioeconomics sections in Chapter 3 or Chapter 4. No revision was needed because the socioeconomics analyses was done at a county level of analysis, which contained the reroute. For the farmland analysis, the reroute was contained within the study area originally examined for the existence of prime, unique, and statewide significant farmlands. No changes were made to the original analysis and conclusions for farmland impacts due to this reroute.

In conclusion, I have no documentation regarding this reroute with the exception of the original email you sent.